

02-277

From: Tom Morgan
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:21 PM
Subject: media consolidation

Dear Commissioner Adelstein,

In one of your upcoming meetings, May I believe, you may be taking a vote on allowing companies to own a greater share of media services within a market. I believe strongly that if you allow companies a greater market share that it will restrict media competition in the United States and will be doing a disservice to the public. In addition, I believe that the public doesn't completely understand this issue and hasn't had sufficient input.

Please vote against this proposal.

Sincerely,
Tom Morgan

From: westmacott@fordham.edu
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:30 PM
Subject: don't deregulate any more of our airwaves

To the Federal Communications Committee:

You probably do not know me but I am a U.S. citizen and partial owner of the airwaves that you regulate. Therefore, you work for me. I am writing to inform you that I am already disgusted enough with the monoculture being presented in my media that you have sold away. The only respite I can get from the profit-driven sludge that is force-fed to me everyday is from public and independent media. (This is sad considering that ALL media is theoretically publically owned - it would not be possible without our airwaves.) Imagine my dismay when I learned that you were considering whether or not to completely eliminate governmental restrictions on the number of media outlets that one company can own. Why would that be a good idea? I mean, I understand that you and your friends would make some more money, but I really don't think that should be the criteria upon which you make this decision. I'm sorry but I'm not dumb enough to believe that the 50 largest media companies spending \$111.3 million to influence Congress and the executive branch between 1996 and 2000 is "free-market capitalism." They look at these expenses as an investment - they would not have spent that money unless they thought that they would get a good return on it. For example, the Broadcasting Industry contributed five million dollars to the campaigns of George W. Bush and Al Gore (they contributed to both to hedge their bets, I don't blame them, why pick a side when it could cost you?) For this investment the industry got free digital TV licenses - a seventy billion dollar value! That's a 1,400,000% return on their investment! And let's not forget that the \$111.3 million had to go somewhere. Now, a hundred million dollars may seem paltry to you, but in the real world that's a lot of money. I know a lot of people who could use that money for much needed food (in 1999, 31 million Americans (12 million of whom were children) were food insecure, meaning they were either hungry or unsure of where their next meal would come from), housing, or healthcare (about 43 million Americans don't have any). But I'm sure they would understand if you and your friends felt that you needed another car or another house or a new swimming pool or whatever you spent your kickback on.

So, the bottom line is that deregulation will not help the public at all, and we know it. I cannot even begin to tell you how many emails I've gotten (some from people I haven't heard from in years who have NEVER taken an interest in anything political before) about how upsetting it is that you would even consider this move. Yes, we're on to you. So don't give away anymore of our airwaves. Keep the restrictions on how many media outlets one company can own (in fact, increase the restrictions). Decreasing the restrictions only means that we get less points of view and less options in our media - and that's not freedom of the press.

Oh, and while you're at it, increase funding for the Public Broadcasting System, the National Public Radio, and the National Endowment for the Arts. Those are all things that the public actually wants. If I hear about you messing with any of those...

Incredibly pissed off and watching your every move,
Johannah Westmacott

155 W. 60th, 7K1
New York, NY 10023

CC: Kathleen Abernathy

From: steve boulanger
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:31 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

steve boulanger (boulanger2@cox.net) writes:

I believe in freedom as much as the next guy, but I hardly think freedom of the jungle is what we need in the media. I appreciate your efforts to oppose any attempts by the FCC to allow even greater media conglomeration than we already have. How will candidates (and even office holders) communicate with citizens? How will minority voices be heard? I dont want to rely on the good will of a few media barons to determine whether or not we have a democratic society or not. We should be striving for greater media diversity of ownership not less. Thanks for your service.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.5.246.81
Remote IP address: 68.5.246.81

From: Konnie Wager
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:32 PM
Subject: Media Ownship

We are concerned with the proposed Media Ownership regulation changes being discussed. We feel that there has not been adequate public debate or reporting by the media to inform the public majority on the affects of the potential changes. We are opposed to allowing fewer companies to own and control more radio stations that utilize the public airwaves.

We have noticed the canned and controlled dissemination of news information that is not relevant to our region and also the decreasing amount of time dedicated to unbiased reporting.

We hope you will consider the long term affects of the pending decisions and its importance to our democracy. Thank you.

Jack and Konnie Wager
15000 NW 21st Ave
Vancouver, Wa 98685

From: Hall
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:32 PM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules

Dear FCC Commissioners,

I would strongly urge you NOT relax the rules for broadcast ownership. Huge media corporations would then dominate the news, and could very well stifle the interplay of ideas necessary for a democracy. Many people do not get cable TV, and we are one of those families. We get three independent news channels now, and that is the way we like it. I would not want only one inevitably biased voice to penetrate my house. It is to be noted that the media do have an effect on public opinion by what they reveal and more importantly by what they do not reveal.

My best regards to all of you.

J. Frederick Hall

CC: kabernath@fcc.gov, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: chas christian
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:33 PM
Subject: Media Concentration

May 4, 2003

Dear Chairman Powell,

The latest proposal to further concentrate the ownership of broadcast totally ignores the fact that the airwaves are owned by the public, and the notion that broadcast media is supposed to operate in the public interest.

Ownership concentration is increasingly moving the broadcast media into becoming a single point of view propaganda source very similar to the Pravda of the USSR.

The ownership concentration of the media and the repeal of the fairness doctrine have turned over the publicly owned airwaves to corporations that present news as politically slanted entertainment, and has turned entertainment programming into absolute garbage.

The FOX network and their coverage of the current events, the Clear Channel group and their computer controlled network of stations, and endless sitcoms that have to tell you when to laugh, are perfect examples of how the public airwaves have been turned into propaganda and advertising outlets.

Charles Christian
2127 Red Rose Way
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

From: Michael Metzler
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:42 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Michael Metzler (actionpublishing@relaypoint.net) writes:

A copy of a letter Chairman Powell encouraging a delay in the vote on further media ownership deregulation:

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am writing to encourage you to delay the impending vote on further deregulation of media ownership and greatly expand the public hearings on this important issue.

The FCC has no right to give the public airways into the hands of a mere handful of commercial enterprises for the personal financial gain of a few. The current trend in media consolidation has already done great damage to our democracy.

The FCC should also restore the common carrier status to broadband cable.

Easily accessable communication for all voices is absolutely essential for democracy. The FCC needs to recognize that its loyalty is to the citizens of the United States and our democracy.

Sincerely,
Michael Metzler
Los Angeles

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.70.70.25
Remote IP address: 68.70.70.25

From: Merle F. Allshouse
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 3:58 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Merle F. Allshouse (allshouse@ureach.com) writes:

Allshouse
15 Crescent Pl. S.
St. Petersburg, FL 33711

May 4, 2003

Dear Commissioner Adelstein:

I am a concerned member of the community and one who depends upon a broadly diversified perspective within our media. I urge you NOT to take any final action on June 2 relative to changing the current standards governing ownership of community media entities. Please consider taking the following actions in the public interest:

-  Provide broad distribution of any proposed changes by publishing the entire text on your web site and encouraging publication of either the full text or summaries in newspapers across the nation;
-  Conduct formal hearings in all major cities and/or media centers;
-  Request all major media to provide advertising and coverage for these hearings.

Thank you very much for your thoughtful consideration.

Respectfully,

Dr. Merle F. Allshouse
Allshouse@ureach.com

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 4.63.170.255
Remote IP address: 4.63.170.255

From: RJ Winbourne
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 4:18 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

RJ Winbourne (rwinbour@midsouth.rr.com) writes:

I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The American people deserve to hear from more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that for decades have helped to ensure healthy political debate in our country. Sincerely, R J Winbourne

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.165.191.90
Remote IP address: 24.165.191.90

From: george w krumme
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 4:23 PM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

george w krumme (gwk@krumme.com) writes:

Please fight to stop further media concentration ownership.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 65.67.205.10
Remote IP address: 65.67.205.10

From: ricochet1221@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, mcopps@fcc.gov, kimweb@fcc.gov,
Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 4:38 PM
Subject: Relaxing rules of Broadcast Ownership

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the FCC:

Power in the hands of few is dangerous. It wreaks of dictatorship and frankly, the working man presently has a full plate of dictatorship from corporations. Relaxing the constraints on Broadcast Ownership would be a dirtect contribution to people control.

Retirees from large corporations have been feeling the heat for years by change of management and who by eliminating policies that existed for years claim poor mouth as an excuse to justify cuts in medical and retirement benefits. Relax the rules on Broadcast Ownership and you'll only open up addition avenues of abuse.

I appreciate your consideration in this matter. Thank you,

James T. Maguire
41 Randolph St.,
Park Ridge, NJ 07656

201-391-9144

From: James J Courtney
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 4:44 PM
Subject: 35% Ownership Rule

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I am writing you in an urgent request to seriously consider that the proposal before you on June 2nd, 2003 that would allow any one entity to hold more than a 35% share in our media is a recipe for disaster. Already our media has been lambasted as being almost entirely the tool of multi-national corporations and government agendas, and with good reason. For a free country, we do not have a very free press.

As a journalism major at the University of South Carolina, the sixth ranked journalism school at the time I attended, a wonderful law and ethics professor, Mark Etheridge, the former editor of the Detroit Free Press, left us with words I found to be both cautionary and prophetic. He asked "who owns the news source, and what do they want you to know?"

With a diverse and varied ownership of our media, we at least have the potential of a free press. If we allow the mega-corporations to gain more control of our media, we are inviting the same levels of tyranny that strangled Soviet Russians, and is conspicuously already limiting the amount and accuracy of information we as Americans enjoy. I know this, because I take the time to read the foreign press, in addition to our own.

At a time when our Constitution is being ransacked, and the very life we know as Americans is under attack, I implore you to do the honorable thing. Deny those self same entities the privilege of controlling our media. Our very freedoms depend on it.

Sincerely,

James J. Courtney, N.D.

From: gblume1@juno.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:07 PM
Subject: Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Gerald Blume
6945 Keith Rd.
Clermont, Georgia 30527-1504

cc:
Senator Saxby Chambliss
Representative Nathan Deal
Senator Zell Miller

From: L.F.Desmond
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:15 PM
Subject: I urge you NOT to relax th broadcast ownership rules.....

I Urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of biew on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Linda F. Desmond
North Andover, Massachusetts 01845-1218

From: Benjamin Sherman
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:20 PM
Subject: Preserve Diversity and Media Ownership Limits - DO NOT Remove Remaining Regulatory Limits on Corporations

Benjamin Sherman
40 Pearl St.
New Bedford, MA 02740

May 4, 2003

Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Michael Powell
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman, Federal Communications Commission Powell:

The FCC must NOT further weaken the rules that help preserve competition and diversity among the owners of American media.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, The Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

The FCC is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal of or further modification to these rules will likely open the door to more mergers that will continue to reduce competition and diversity in the media. If the rules are weakened further, one company in a city could control the most popular newspaper, TV station and possibly the cable system, giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of news and information. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in this country. Media ownership would be concentrated by corporate monopolies even further, and the public's ability to have open, informed discussion with diverse viewpoints would be compromised.

I do not believe that the studies commissioned by the FCC accurately demonstrate the negative affects media deregulation and consolidation have had on media diversity. While there may be indeed be more sources of media than ever before, the spectrum of views presented have become more limited.

The right to carry on informed debate and discussion of current events is part of the founding philosophy of our nation. Our forefathers believed that democracy was best served by a diverse marketplace of ideas. If the FCC allows our media outlets to merge, our ability to have open, informed discussion with a wide variety of viewpoints will be compromised.

The public interest will best be served by preserving media ownership rules in question in this proceeding.

I think it is important for the FCC to not only consider the points of view of those with a financial interest in this issue, but also those with a social or civic interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is incumbent on the Commission to take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Sherman

From: Dale Hall
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:20 PM
Subject: FCC Biennial Regulatory Review 2002

Hello,

I am concerned that the variety of news reported is already much limited by the high level of consolidation. I believe that the current regulations should be strengthened not dismantled. My understanding is that the FCC charter is to further competition in the interest of the American public. Please do not reduce the regulation to enable a few large organizations to control the news media.

Thank you,
Dale Hall

The new MSN 8: smart spam protection and 2 months FREE*

From: Carolyn K Peterson
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:31 PM
Subject: FCC Regulations

Dear Commissioner Adelstein

I understand that there is a move afoot to permit bigger communication organizations to buy local, smaller ones. This would mean that only a few giant companies would dictate what we as a nation hear or view. Can you tell me more about the FCC's dismantlement of these last rules that would stop more consolidation by large communications organizations? I understand the larger organizations have been lobbying for this issue because they say it's economically more efficient.

I believe that this is a mistake for the following reasons.

- If only a few major organizations own all the media outlets, then how is the population to get both sides of an issue? I believe we still live in a democracy, or has that changed? We have a right to freedom of speech in the United States and getting information, for or against an issue, is necessary under a democracy. I don't see this happening if only a few powerful companies own all the media outlets.

- In time of local emergency, how are the local populations going to be notified? If you are operating, for instance, a radio station with canned programming which usually has no live broadcaster, and a hurricane heading for a small town, who will notify the population? It seems to me that there is an issue of public safety on local levels that also needs to be addressed.

I am hoping that the Commissioners at the FCC are going to look into this issue seriously and will make an educated decision when it comes to voting for or against this issue. I do not support this consolidation by the FCC. I know that the FCC is being pressured by major organizations, but the decision you make on this issue may mean the end of our democracy as we know it today.

It's in your hands. Please keep me informed.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Peterson
PO Box 816
Cedar Crest, NM 87008

From: Michael Howard
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:38 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

Dear Mr. Adelstein,

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a know track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protection that, for decades, have helped to ensure a health political debate in our country.

Sincerely,

Michael Howard
Rogers, Arkansas

From: Ka55free@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:44 PM
Subject: Media de-regulation

It is not in the best interest of the people of the United States to further de-regulate their media. A vote on June 2 to not eliminate the ban on media cross-ownership and ease other ownership regulations will aid more opinions being expressed in the media and informing the public.

Thank you.
KA McCarty
1114 SE Bel-Aire Road
Ankeny, IA

From: Ka55free@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:44 PM
Subject: Media de-regulation

It is not in the best interest of the people of the United States to further de-regulate their media. A vote on June 2 to not eliminate the ban on media cross-ownership and ease other ownership regulations will aid more opinions being expressed in the media and informing the public.

Thank you.
KA McCarty
1114 SE Bel-Aire Road
Ankeny, IA

From: bob van
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:46 PM
Subject: Cross-ownership

May 4, 2003

Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner, FCC

Dear Commissioner,

Below find a copy of a letter I recently sent to Chairman Michael K Powell expressing my views concerning the cross-ownership of radio, television and printed media. I feel strongly this is not in the best interests of the general public. I would appreciate your help in not allowing cross-ownership to take place.

Sincerely,

R.E. Van Velkinburgh, 2081 West Craig Lane, Syracuse, Utah 84075

E-Mail address bjvan@prodigy.net

Michael F Powell Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Powell,

I read with a great deal of interest a copy of your remarks at the Associated Press Annual Meeting and General Session of the National Newspaper Association Annual Convention on April 28, 2003. I agree that over the years technology has made many changes in our communications industry making regulation more and more difficult.

You stated that cross-ownership involving radio and television stations and the printed media could allow for more efficient production and expand programming. This may be true but is it the responsibility of the FCC to help increase the bottom line of communication corporations? I see a real danger in cross-ownership. This would make it possible for one corporation to own and control all the radio stations, all the television stations, and all the newspapers in a given community. While "efficiencies" could be gained the result would be a single viewpoint on news and events coverage. Daily programming on radio and television would reflect management choices. How could this possibly be in the public interest?

So far as expanding programming is concerned, it is well known that a monopoly is not prone to try any new innovations but instead tries to maintain the status quo.

It is for these reasons that at your up-coming meeting June 2, 2003 I respectfully ask you not to allow cross-ownership to be made legal.

Sincerely,
R.E. Van Velkinburgh
2081 West Craig Lane
Syracuse, Utah 84075

From: Rcb339@cs.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:47 PM
Subject: Media Ownership

Dear Mr. Michael K. Powell,

May 3, 2003

It has come to my attention that on June 2, 2003 sweeping reforms are going to occur which will affect media ownership in the U.S., thus allowing for greater consolidation of broadcasting outlets. I am writing to ask you not to support legislation which would allow increased monopolization of the media.

There must be government regulations on the number of broadcast outlets a corporation can own so as to stimulate competition within the market. Media broadcasting is not a commodity that can be subject to the free market. Deregulation will only discourage smaller companies by making it more difficult for them to compete with those media conglomerates who will most likely be the winners in the effort to deregulate.

By not placing caps on media ownership a greater number of voices will not be heard. The current situation is dismal enough, which can be witnessed in the ignorance of public awareness with respect to this very issue and in the homogeneity of TV coverage of the Iraq War. A.M. radio is another atrocious example of the way differences in opinion has been stifled as a result of deregulatory legislation passed in 1996.

Diversity of opinion is critical for a democracy to be viable and allowing for competition within media broadcasting market is an extremely important means of obtaining that diversity. If one company is permitted to own more than one broadcasting outlet, surely variety of opinion will diminish.

The airwaves belong to the people. They should not be a commodity which can be bought on the open market. Once more I urge you to respect the right of the people to ownership of the broadcast airwaves by maintaining current legislation regarding caps on ownership of media outlets.

Sincerely,

Richard Cabrera

From: Carleton Spotts
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sun, May 4, 2003 5:52 PM
Subject: revision of media ownership rules

112 times in the Communications Act, Congress used the term "public interest." I am the public; you are the public, my neighbor is the public; CORPORATIONS ARE NOT THE PUBLIC. It is contrary to the obvious intention of Congress and it is contrary to the continuation of our representative democracy to allow small numbers of large corporations to control the media. I am particularly concerned with its news function which already has become monolithic. Please don't expand this policy and thereby create less variety in news coverage. Thank you.